



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ing with the true aboriginal parrot toed gait in an elegant costume of party colored feathers, and porcupine's quills! We have had no room to notice the minor characters in the book; but we can assure our readers that they are all as well sustained, and have as much verisimilitude as that of Washington himself.

We are glad to learn from the introduction to the 'Spectre of the Forest,' that our author has found with the public all the favor, which he so highly deserves. We have no time for a minute analysis of this latter work. We can only say, there is nothing in it quite equal to Washington; but still, upon the whole, it is rather a bolder attempt than the *Wilderness*. The scene is laid chiefly in Connecticut, and the manners of our puritan ancestors are intended to be described. The machinery of horror is far more various and complicated than in the *Wilderness*. We have wars, Indians, wild beasts, witches, trials, hangings, mobs, pirates, regicides, all conspiring against the reader's peace in every page. But on the other hand, we have the solace of such society as Prior, Dryden, Addison, besides the king and the queen, judges, bishops, dukes, lords, and gentlemen, which to be sure we are obliged to go to England to enjoy, but with which we are amply repaid for all our trouble, seeing so many and so great personages as familiarly as Scott himself could have shown them. The Spectre, who appears and disappears in a most astonishing manner on all great occasions, and constantly stands ready to help the author through every difficulty, turns out to be no other than Goffe, one of those who subscribed to Charles' execution, and who is said to have secreted himself for several years in this country.

ART. XII.—*Debate in Congress on the Bill to amend the several Acts for imposing Duties on Imports.* 1824.

ON examining the speeches made upon the tariff question, we find that, as far as the *principle* of the restrictive policy goes, the argument is given up by its friends. Under the form of ridicule ineffectually cast on several distinguished

writers upon political economy, the reasoning of those writers seems to be admitted to be irrefragable. Under the pretence of passing over their arguments as metaphysical, they are admitted to be such as allow no reply ; since no one probably will think, that the friends of the tariff policy would neglect to refute, if possible, the doctrines of the most approved writers on political economy, and prove them to be as false as they maintain them to be impracticable. To show more distinctly, from an unexceptionable source, in what way the friends of the tariff treat the arguments of some of the most sensible authors of the last and present century, we make the following quotations from the speech of the Chairman of the Committee of Manufactures.

‘ Bonaparte and the British ministry, it has been stated, wrangled for whole weeks if not months during the peace of 1803, (?) about the quantities of goods, which the people of the two nations might exchange with each other ; each party obstinate to the very last in refusing to take the products of the other, unless they were permitted to be paid for in the product of the nation receiving them. Whether right or not, all this was done by statesmen ; and let it not be forgotten that, while doing it, they had all the metaphysical books of the economists before their eyes ; or if not all their books, yet all their discoveries had been made before that time ; made and published by Frenchmen and by Britons for the good of their own dear countries, and calculated for their own latitudes. Of these discoveries the grandest is said to be, that, in order to get rich, a nation has nothing to do but to refuse to eat, drink, or wear anything made or produced at home, provided it can be had cheaper from abroad, so that we see how completely opposite to these discoveries has been the practice of the two nations ; and from this, and from all their conduct before and since, it is plain, that the two countries, which produced these political economists, have always looked upon them as so many conceited enthusiasts, and have taken special care never to meddle, practically, with their books, except so far as to print and export them. In some foreign countries they have had, to be sure, an amazing run. I am not going to try my hand at disentangling their arguments. Let it be, that all their reasoning on the subject is so correctly metaphysical and so deep, as not to be comprehended nor refuted. What then ? In legislating for a great country, are we to draw our information and our opinions from the deductions of theoretical writers ? Or are we to look to the practice of statesmen and to the actual effect, which different systems have had on the prosperity and decay of nations ?’

This extract, coinciding as it does with the sentiments expressed in almost every speech on the same side of the question, appears to us to justify the assertion, that the friends of the tariff policy admit the argument of their opponents to be unanswerable. They cast on this argument, indeed, the reproach of being metaphysical and abstract, but tell us they do not undertake to enter into it,—they appeal to practice. Now it seems to us rather an unpromising aspect of a policy, that it begins by resisting the deductions of men, who have, with great concert of opinion and reasoning, established the principles of the science that treats of this policy. What, we may well ask, is the meaning of a *practical* man in the business of a tariff? You reject the conclusions of Smith and Say, and appeal to the practice of ministers and financiers; and you call the former theoretical, and the latter practical men. But why appropriate the terms thus, or rather why give the name of practical, in this connexion, to the minister rather than to the writer? The truth is, that *practical* is a term not well applied, on either side, to the subject. There is a propriety in the distinction of practical and theoretical, when applied to the arts of life; a practical farmer is properly opposed to a scientific agriculturist; a practical artist to an adept in mechanical philosophy. But what do the friends of the tariff mean, when they talk of a practical system as opposed to a theoretical, in regard to the proper national policy of encouragement extended to different branches of industry? What makes a statesman, in this respect, a practical man? He has not followed any one of the pursuits, which he taxes or encourages. He has been neither a merchant, a manufacturer, nor a planter; neither a collector of customs, nor an excise-man. Nay more, it rarely happens that he is himself the author of the system he administers. He is not a practical man, even in the limited sense of having devised and matured the various prohibitory or protecting duties, which he maintains in existence. These, in all the old countries of Europe, have been the growth of centuries. They have many of them been imposed to meet particular occasions; some duties have been contrived to balance others, and they now must remain, because immense sacrifices would be made by repealing them.

To administer such a system, a nobleman of strong connexions, or a political leader of transcendant talents, comes into office. Nothing would be wider from the truth, than to suppose he comes there to do what he thinks in itself right ; nothing more unjust, than to quote him in favor of a system which he continues or even enforces, because he cannot alter it. Nothing is more preposterous, moreover, than to call him a *practical* man in reference to this business, on the score of his introducing into the legislature or presenting to the king, the laws or decrees, which the regulation and adjustment of the conflicting parts of such a system, from time to time, require. What information he needs, to discharge these official duties, he seeks from the tradesmen, artisans, or planters, who possess it, and the books which contain it ; what principles he acts on, he has formed from observation, reflection, and reading. In this way and no other do the writers on political economy gather their facts and form their opinions. But, in general, the business of tariffs and duties is the smallest part of the *practice* of these statesmen, who are strangely looked up to by American legislators. Wars, the balance of power, coalitions, ambitious projects abroad, intrigues at home, the preservation of place, jobs for friends, these are the things, which constitute the practice of statesmen, far more considerably than the administration of the great national interests.

If there be any propriety in connecting the epithet *practical* with this subject, we should think it belonged precisely to the writers, who are derided as theoretical. The Chairman of the Committee of Manufactures, in that homely way, which characterises him, intimates that Dr Smith and his school were but ‘conceited enthusiasts.’ And yet the Doctor was a cool, sagacious man ; he devoted twenty years and more to the composition of the *Wealth of Nations*. The book itself proves that no minister or statesman could be better acquainted with the facts relative to every part of the public system than he ; not only in his own country, but in almost every other. He particularly sought and received information from all, who were best able to afford it, of which an important instance is mentioned in the case of the bank of Amsterdam, in the preface to the fourth edition. Much of his life was employed in investigations, much of his high

reputation pledged on successfully treating this subject, and who can be better entitled than he, in this connexion, to the name of *practical*, we cannot conceive. *Cuique in arte sua credendum est* ; nor is there one circumstance, that justly gives the name of practical to a statesman, in this connexion, which would not give it far more decisively to Smith.

Or take the case of Mr Ricardo, also one of these ‘conceited enthusiasts,’ these metaphysical dreamers. He was a man, who, from being an indigent Jew, of Portuguese descent, raised himself to a princely fortune, to a seat in parliament, to respectability in the best English circles, to an equality with what that country has of most intelligent. Mr Ricardo had the reputation of being, of all men in Europe, the best versed in the really abstract subject of money ; and his opinions in the House of Commons, on this subject, were received with proportionate respect. What is there, in such a man, to authorise the stigma of conceited enthusiasm and metaphysical abstraction ? Why is he theoretical, and lord Castlereagh practical ? We say again, that of the two, Mr Ricardo is the practical man. A fortune of three or four millions of dollars, acquired by his own industry, sagacity, and success ; invested in the most various forms, in the stocks, in manufactures, in landed estates ; several years passed in the legislature, in which on all questions connected with finance he was allowed to take a lead ; and finally, that peculiar *stimulus* to investigation, which arises from undertaking to write upon a subject, and thus committing a high reputation to public scrutiny ; all these seem to be circumstances, which constitute Mr Ricardo a practical man in the business he treated. If he was not, we know not what the word means. If he be not better entitled to the name, than the ministers, who probably devote fewer hours than he did days to this subject ; then we confess that the essence of a *practical* economist is indeed a metaphysical subtlety, which we cannot grasp. The name is easily claimed, but we apprehend it would exceed the ingenuity of the Chairman of the Committee of Manufactures, to define the thing in any way, which would make Mr Canning the practical, and Mr Ricardo the theoretical person.

But the chairman tells us, in his plain way, that ‘he is not going to try to disentangle the arguments of these writers. Let it be, that all their reasoning is so correctly metaphysical

and so deep, as not to be comprehended nor refuted.' We can infer only, from this way of speaking, that our practical statesman has never read them. We much fear, that he and many of his colleagues are in the predicament of persons, who deride what they have not given themselves the trouble to become acquainted with. If the worthy chairman will but read the *Wealth of Nations*, we assure him he will find it a perpetual feast. Supposing him too candid to quarrel with a book of considerable extent, because some of its views may appear to him unsound, it will be with great satisfaction that the chairman will find much of the *Wealth of Nations* to commend itself even to him, as sound practical wisdom. He will be agreeably disappointed to discover in it a vast fund of information, on all the pursuits of society ; a steady choice of the moderate, gradual, and prudent over the speculative and hazardous ; a preference of the home market over a foreign market. He will find, to his amazement, that the Report of General Hamilton, which he so much lauds, is in a good measure borrowed from the work of Smith, which he so much sneers at. If the chairman would give it an attentive and candid perusal, we feel sure that he would wonder at the epithets, which he has so unjustly bestowed upon him.

We might say nearly as much of the work of Mr Say. Abating the chapters, which bear hard on the tariff policy, we assure the chairman of the committee, that the greater part of the work will appear to him sound and judicious ; the production of a strong and richly furnished mind. In both these works, he will find neither pomp nor obscurity of language ; no splitting of hairs, no far pursued chase after theories, unsupported by instances and facts. In Say, particularly, he will be struck with a singular plainness, an occasional heartiness of manner, which though rather more refined than the chairman's own, bears the same stamp of sincerity. He will positively not find one proposition in the work, on which he can put his finger and fairly pronounce it *metaphysical*, in the opprobrious sense of that term ; not one proposition, which he can comfort himself by calling obscure or recondite ; or from which he can well turn aside, as fantastical and far fetched.

If this be true, and we appeal to every candid man, (whatever he thinks of the tariff policy,) who has read these works, that it is true ; we would ask what propriety there is, in the

tone adopted towards these writers, in the late debate? We would also ask, whether the doctrines of such men do not require to be fairly met and disproved, not by the compendious course of an appeal to the practice of statesmen, but by manly counter reasonings; by showing that the doctrines in question rest on false premises, or irregular deductions from true ones. Till this is done, the friends of the tariff system must be content to have it said, by fair and candid observers, that they give up the defence of their cause by argument.

But we have not quite done with this topic. Not only do the chairman of the committee, and his colleagues, do great injustice to what really is contained in the writings of the political economists; but they commit the equally gross injustice of throwing out, as a standing answer to every antitariff statement, that it is borrowed from these books. They first attempt to give the books the abovementioned character, and then think they have answered any statement by saying, it comes from the books, it is merely the *ipse dixit* of Adam Smith. An example will make this clear. Mr Webster, in the course of his speech, took occasion to speak of the exploded doctrine of the *Balance of Trade*, which he had rightly denominated *jargon* and *nonsense*. After showing it to be so, by the most rigid and severe exposition of the nature of commercial exchanges, in which not an allusion was made to any writer or book, he closes the topic with this appeal to '*practice*.'

'Allow me, Sir, to give an instance, tending to show how unaccountably individuals deceive themselves, and imagine themselves to be somewhat rapidly mending their condition, while they ought to be persuaded that, by that infallible standard, *the balance of trade*, they are on the high road to ruin. Some years ago, in better times than the present, a ship left one of the towns of New England with 70,000 specie dollars. She proceeded to Mocha, on the Red Sea, and there laid out these dollars in coffee, drugs, spices, &c. With this new cargo she proceeded to Europe; two thirds of it were sold in Holland for 130,000 dollars, which the ship brought back, and placed in the same Bank, from the vaults of which she had taken her original outfit. The other third was sent to the ports of the Mediterranean, and produced a return of 25,000 dollars in specie, and 15,000 dollars in Italian merchandise. These sums together make 170,000 dollars imported, which is 100,000 dollars more than was exported, and is therefore proof of an unfavorable *balance of trade*, to that amount, in this adventure.

We should find no great difficulty, Sir, in paying off our balances, if this were the nature of them all.'

And how does the Chairman of the Committee of Manufactures reply to this? We feel regret in quoting him. After naming Mr Webster in the preceding paragraph, and calling him 'more of a philosopher than a politician,' he goes on to add, 'not a little has been said about the *balance of trade*, and we have been beset, throughout almost the whole of this debate, *by authorities drawn from the books of the writers called modern political economists.*' Is this fair, above all in a practical man? Mr Webster quoted no book on this subject. The principle, which he very happily illustrated, may be found, indeed, in several books. But Mr Webster did not go to them for it, did not give it on any authority, but its own selfevidence. Why did not the chairman, if he really was desirous of treating the subject practically, confute this practical instance; and show how, on *his* theory of the balance of trade, the Mocha voyage could be profitable.

With respect to this pretended contrast of a practical and theoretical policy nothing is more certain, than that it is an alternative, not between theory and practice, but between two theories. On one side it is said to be the interest of the nation to leave the direction of individual industry to individual judgment. This you object is a theory. Be it so. But when in return you say, with the chairman of the committee, that it is best for the government to direct individual industry, that government is nothing but restriction, that it is for the sake of restriction that men formed societies, and the like; is not this a theory? What is there more *practical* in this proposition, than in the first? And which is the most rational, which looks most practicable, which is most republican? The records of the inquisition do not contain a doctrine more purely despotic in its tendency, than, that all government is restriction. The object of government is directly the reverse, to devise the smallest amount of restriction, by which the greatest liberty can be secured.

Again, the approved writers on political economy say, that it is conducive to the national wealth that every individual consumer should buy where he can buy cheapest, and, which is the necessary consequence, sell where he can sell dearest; that is, where he can get most necessities and comforts for

the fruits of his labor. This is said to be mere theory. But, on the other hand, when the friends of the tariff policy tell us, it is more conducive to national wealth, that the consumer buy of a countryman, is not that theory? Must it not be shown, that the former is a false theory, and the latter a true theory, and till this is shown, do they not, as theories, stand on the same ground? At any rate, if the theories of political economy be not unintelligible or absurd *in their terms*, which we presume is not pretended, they are either true or false; if true, they are confirmed in practice, for that is the meaning of a true theory, viz. a theory which agrees with the facts; if false, they can be shown to be so. But so far from this being done, the advocates of the tariff policy call them metaphysical, and turn their backs on them.

Still, though we complain of the way in which the argument on the *principle* of the tariff policy has been met, we allow very cheerfully that the appeal to the practice of those countries, which have all either prohibited or severely taxed imported manufactures, is a fair argument, and we shall do our best to answer it fairly. As it is put in the front rank of defence, by the friends of the tariff, as it is made to serve as an answer to all arguments on the principle of their policy, we shall reply to it, with the attention due to the importance with which it is thus clothed. We observe, then, in the first place, that this argument takes for granted the very thing to be proved, and that with the widest comprehension both of premises and conclusion. It is asserted that America is in a distressed, impoverished, and declining state; that certain foreign nations are rich and prosperous; that their tariffs of heavy and prohibitory duties on imported goods, and the consequent encouragement of manufactures, are the cause of this prosperity; and that, therefore, America has only to imitate these foreign nations in introducing the causes, and the effect will follow. Reduced to a series of plain propositions, the foregoing is the great argument from the practice of statesmen and the example of other nations, which has been made to serve as an answer to the best established principles of political economy. Now we consider it perfectly correct to observe, that this whole statement of facts is erroneous. We deny each proposition in the series. We deny that this country is in a state of impoverishment and ruin. We deny

that any foreign country is prosperous compared with America. We deny that there is sufficient ground to ascribe what prosperity is enjoyed by foreign nations to the restrictive system; and we finally deny that this system, even if productive of prosperity abroad, could be, with any certainty, depended on to produce the same effects here, considering the different circumstances of the old and of the new world.

With regard to the first point, that this country is incorrectly alleged to be in a state of impoverishment and ruin, we should think it presumptuous to endeavor to add anything to the views, which are taken by Mr Webster in the commencement of his speech. We can ascribe it only to the conviction, into which an ardent mind may excite itself on *any* subject, that a statesman, so enlightened as Mr Clay, whose political glance is comprehensive enough to take in the whole of a country, should, on the ground of the facts, which he has collected in his speech on the tariff, draw the conclusion that this country is really, at this moment, on the whole, in an abject state. We rejoice that we are able, on this point, to appeal from this his unfavorable judgment, to his own on another occasion, where he justly speaks of 'this happy' this 'favored land;' and represents it, as it is, full of energy, resource, and power. Nor is that gentleman unacquainted with the distress of Europe, nor with the hollow, unsubstantial, and deceptive nature of its prosperity. On this point also we shall make but a few incidental remarks, when led to the subject, in pursuance of what we esteem the most important proposition, viz. that even if the great foreign states are prosperous, there is not sufficient ground to ascribe their prosperity to their tariffs.

The aggregate condition of a nation, its general state of poor or rich, prosperous or declining, is a very complex effect, sometimes perhaps resulting from some few very predominant causes, but far more commonly from the joint effect of numerous institutions, laws, and national habits. To say, because you wish to recommend a high tariff, that foreign nations are prosperous, and foreign nations have high tariffs, and therefore the tariffs are the cause of the prosperity, appears to us an unstatesmanlike language. These nations, whose example in respect of the tariff is pressed upon us, have all of them many other institutions, far more prominent and marked, and really exerting a far more decisive effect on the

public condition, than any which can be rationally ascribed to laws regulating the importation of foreign goods. They have forms of hereditary monarchical, sometimes despotic government. Is not this an institution, which, traced in all its connexions and consequences, is a far more prominent institution than a commercial tariff, and therefore more entitled to be selected as the cause of the national condition, be it prosperous or adverse? These nations, moreover, have orders of nobility, immense landed capitals and very powerful political influence secured to certain families. They have vast standing armies, they have foreign insular or continental possessions. Now we are certainly not saying, that any one of these or all together, can make a nation prosperous and happy, without various other things, which we have not yet named. Yet we submit it to any one, who reflects on the springs of national character, that any one of these institutions must exert a far more decisive influence on the nation's condition, than its tariff; and of course there is no reason for ascribing the power and prosperity of the foreign nations to an engine of comparatively insignificant force, while others so potent are in action. Why fix on the tariff of duties to account for a national condition, which unquestionably arises from the combined operation of very various causes among which the tariff, at best, can be only one; from the institutions inherited from a remote ancestry, from geographical features, from the laws affecting the distribution and security of property, and, above all, from the state of civil freedom?

But it is not enough to say that the friends of the tariff, in adopting a course of reasoning like this, make use of an illogical argument; they really contradict the most unquestioned deductions not of political economy, for that admirable science some of them deride, but of political history and political experience. We freely confess, that it is of great importance that the most wise and most judicious laws, could they but be ascertained as such, should be enacted in the various and interesting branches of industry, even to the most insignificant details. But when this is done, it is idle to say that any one of them is the main spring of national prosperity. They do not make it, where the other and higher principles of public growth are wanting; nor do they destroy it, where these exist. It is the more important to make this remark,

for in the zeal of defending or opposing a measure like the tariff, politicians on either side of the question, are apt to form narrow views of the true sources of national condition. We owe it to our cardinal institutions, to assert their importance ; to ascribe to them the prosperity of which they are the real source ; and to trace to their absence, in the countries unfortunate enough to want them, the degeneracy and decline, which this want invariably produces. Political independence, as contrasted with colonial subjection, or great subserviency to a powerful neighbor ; a limited government, and still more, a representative government ; the trial by jury, the freedom of the press, the equality of laws, the security of property ; these are the springs of national prosperity ; these make a nation powerful, prosperous, rich ; increase its population, multiply its resources. A nation where these abound possesses a principle of life capable of bearing up under enormous burdens, and of resisting the power of the most insidious and the most malignant political diseases.

In the example of England we see, that a principle of life and power may be infused into a nation, capable of reacting against the most formidable attacks from without and from within. But is there a statesman in Congress, who, passing over the institution of representative government, however defective, (and monstrosly corrupt and defective it is in that country,) passing over an equal administration of justice, a free press, the security of property, and an insular situation, will deliberately say that it is not these, which have made the nation rich and powerful, but her laws against the importation of German linen and French cloth ? We cannot think it. We cannot believe that any statesman in America, in that country where the omnipotence, if we may venture on the term, of free institutions has been developed in a certainty and glory never seen before in the world, could be willing deliberately to do his country, and the blessings bestowed on it, such injustice, as to say, these are all nothing to the public happiness, till the duty on woollens is raised eight per cent. An American statesman ought to read in the history of his own country, if not in that of others, what it is that makes nations grow and prosper. He ought to see what it was, which lifted this continent of Northern America from a colony, and a province, into a mighty empire, and that too under a

system of metropolitan government, so iniquitous, that we durst not manufacture a hobnail, nor transport a felt hat from province to province. If gentlemen think a high tariff good, very good, let them say so. If certain trades languish for the want of it, nothing can be fairer than that those concerned in them should importune Congress for relief. It is natural that the representatives of those districts of the country, which will be most benefited by the exclusion of foreign fabrics, should urge and press the enactment of laws, that will promote the interest of their constituents. But we would not behold high minded politicians ready to see, in every favorite measure of local advantage, the *sine qua non* of national prosperity. The tone of legislation is lamentably lowered, when we ascribe to 'cockets and clearances,' to duties specific and ad valorem, what those duties never did and never can impart.

Nay, there are causes, which, though much lower than the lofty political ones alluded to, are nevertheless more powerful in their influence on the national condition, than laws of so limited a sphere as the tariff. Dr Franklin said that England owed her predominance to her coal mines; and Lowe, in his late work, names them among three or four other causes, (of which the tariff is not one,) of the prosperity of England. Certainly, it is true that geographical position, climate, fertility, and conveniences for internal navigation, are infinitely more important than any law, however broad its enactments, saving such as go to affect the tenure and security of property.

The difference of nations is enough to show, that it must be these physical and political causes combined, which ascertain their condition. Their tariffs, as we have been abundantly, nay, tauntingly told, they all have; that is, all the supposed prosperous ones. France, England, Russia, Austria, have all their innumerable laws to secure to their manufacturers the supply of their respective countries. But yet how different the condition of these nations; England alone immensely rich; France, Russia, Austria, in various degrees poor as nations; poor in respect to the private fortunes of individuals. And yet all that tariffs can do has been done in them all. The French, notwithstanding the superiority of English capital and machinery, have brought their woollens to perfection; and the linens of Silesia bear witness, that a

manufacture may flourish in an impoverished country, an enslaved province. If a tariff is the grand *arcanum* of national condition, if it be that, which, by its presence or absence makes nations prosperous or the reverse, why are not France, Austria, Russia, and England equally rich, powerful, and flourishing ; why does not the same cause, if thus energetic, produce the same effect ?

In fact the proposition becomes so absurd, by being dwelt upon, that those, who have not followed the course of the debate on the tariff question, will find it hard to believe that it could have been seriously urged ; and yet nothing is more certain, than that no answer was attempted to all the general reasonings against the tariff, but this, that foreign nations, which had tariffs, were prosperous. Nay more, the converse of this extravagant position was sustained in Congress, and it was strangely asserted, that the decline and impoverishment of such nations as Spain, Portugal, and Poland, were owing to their want of a tariff of duties on foreign fabrics. To assert this is so entirely to shut one's eyes on the spectacle of political history, and to introduce a paradox so monstrous, that it ought for a moment to be animadverted upon. We are surprised that accomplished statesmen, like Mr Clay, should find no more powerful cause of the decline of Spain, than the importation of British woollens. The expulsion of the Moors and Jews, absolute monarchy, the inquisition, the division of the country into independent kingdoms, with custom houses on the barriers, the absorption of wealth and men by the convents and the church, the license of driving hundreds of thousands of sheep across the kingdom, are these such insignificant causes of national decline, that the importation of British cloth should be fixed on, to the exclusion of them all ? There are even commercial causes of the decline of Spain far more obvious. Uztariz, a tariff man in the main, thus speaks of the prosperity of his country.

‘ After the strictest inquiry, and a most mature consideration of the duties imposed on commodities and goods in Spain, and other kingdoms and states, I have not been able to discover in France, England, or Holland, nations that best know the value of Commerce, that they ever laid any duty upon the sale or barter of their own woven and other manufactures, either upon the first or any future sale. As then I find Spain alone groaning under this bur-

den, and it is so very oppressive, as to lay *ten per cent*, for the primitive Alcavala, and the *four one per cents* annexed to it, a duty not only chargeable on the first sale, but on every future sale of goods, I am jealous that it is one of the principal engines that contributed to the ruin of most of our manufactures and trades.*

We should apprehend that those, who find the causes of national growth and decline in circumstances like these, would be satisfied with a duty of fourteen per cent on every transfer of property, as sufficient, without the aid of foreign importation. The same author gives us a view of the duties on silk.

' Duties chargeable upon every Pound of Granada Silk.

	Maravedis Vellon.
For the Alcavala, - - - - -	302
„ Cientos, - - - - -	104
„ Tartil, - - - - -	8
„ Arbitrio, - - - - -	68
„ Torres de la Mer, - - - - -	4 1-2
„ Geliz, - - - - -	15 1-2
	<hr/>
	502

The amount of these duties is five hundred and two maravedis, which make fourteen reals, twenty six maravedis, to which are to be added the duty of the diezmo, collected on the account of the royal revenue, but variable according to the price of the commodity, and that year was ninety two maravedis, as a pound of silk was then valued at twenty seven reals vellon, before the charging of any duties. Thus, if we include the diezmo, the duties amounted to seventeen reals, sixteen maravedis vellon upon each pound, which is above sixty per cent of the value of the silk, before it goes into the loom, a load so very oppressive, and such a clog upon the culture and manufacture of silk, that every person must needs confess it; and for his conviction, there needs only the bare mention of the fact, as it stands in that chapter; however, I have thought proper to take notice of it in this place, though it will give a fresh mortification to recollect this lamentable piece of mismanagement, but it is with a view, that when the whole of this misfortune is fairly laid open, we may better judge of the necessity of applying a remedy.'

From these statements of a highly respectable Spanish author, the friends of the tariff policy, in this country, if they choose to find the causes of the impoverishment of Spain in her legislation on these subjects, may perceive that it was

* Uztariz' Theory and Practice of Commerce, Vol. II. 236.

something very different from low duties on imports, with which the Spanish manufacturer had to struggle. In fact, it is plain that the free admission of foreign goods was, in the state of inaction to which the combined operation of the causes above indicated had reduced the country, the only mode in which Spain could invest the specie of the American colonies, and the country be saved from entire ruin. Without liberty, security, industrious habits, and freedom of internal trade, there could not have been cloth enough woven at home to cover the backs of the population; and it was nothing but the free access of foreign goods, which enabled them to convert a part of the almost worthless specie of the Indies into the wants and comforts of life. The only good feature in the whole Spanish system was that, by moderate duties on imports, the people had some means left of supplying themselves on reasonable terms, with articles of first necessity. And yet we are told, that it was not the Inquisition, it was not the engrossing of the property of the country by the church, it was not the barrier between the kingdoms, it was not the *mesta* which ruined Spain, but the want of a tariff of high duties on imports. Is there an American who will believe it? If there be one who, wearied with the iteration of it in essays, addresses, and memorials, is tempted to think it may be true, let him fancy the principle put to the test in his own country. Establish a despotic monarchy, and a nobility, reduce the population of America from ten to five millions, by a series of cruel laws, as that of Spain has been reduced from sixteen millions to eight, constitute a holy inquisition in the predominating sect, and visit the firesides and hearts of the population with the terrors of the rack and the stake, lock up a third of the wealth in mortmain for the benefit of a lazy priesthood, and hundreds of thousands of monkish drones, forbid the exportation of specie, and thereby do all that laws can do to annihilate its exchangeable value in foreign trade, permit the several states to collect heavy transit duties on their frontiers, and let the general government lay a tax of fourteen per cent on every sale; when the country is thus reduced to a sheep walk, for barrenness, make it literally one, as Spain is, by sending twice a year across the kingdom a desolating horde of semibarbarous shepherds with their vast flocks; and then enact a tariff. Will it save the country, will it raise it.

will it create capital, excite industry, awaken enterprise, secure property ; or will it not rather cut off the last source of supply to a ruined people ? Yet this is precisely the case with Spain, and nearly so with Portugal. As for Poland, well known to be both before and after the partition, the worst ruled country in Europe, to ascribe its poverty to the want of a tariff, is to sin against the light of republican institutions, and good government. To forbid the wretched inhabitants of that land to exchange their corn, the only blessing which their own anarchy and foreign despotism have not wrested from them, for a supply of necessary articles of manufacture from abroad, would be to take away the only remaining alleviation of the most calamitous national existence, into which a people can be plunged.

In what we have hitherto said, we have proceeded upon the admission, that in comparison with the wretchedness of America, in some foreign countries the restrictive system was really associated with a high degree of prosperity, if not of the population at large, at least of those interests, which the tariffs are designed to protect. The whole argument of the friends of the tariff assumed this of course as granted. Mr Clay exerted all the powers of his brilliant imagination, wide observation of facts, and happy power of combination and arrangement, and produced a picture, which one could not indeed contemplate without pain, of the impoverishment of America. Contrasted with this, though less distinctly, and with some misgiving, we apprehend, of the solidity of the ground on which he was treading, he sketched in bold lines, the resources and prosperity of England. By less able hands than his, this same contrast was less cautiously made, and we were again and again called to compassionate the prostration into which our infant manufactures fell, for want of protection on the return of peace ; the invested capital that was sacrificed, the prosperous undertaker that was ruined, the industrious laborer driven from his employment, and the resounding factory, over whose lately busy wheels, the stream now breaks with profitless clamor ; and all for want of a tariff. Now let us look at England, the paragon of protecting policy, the chancery of prohibitory laws, the metropolis of the tariff policy. We assert it as a fact, which admits no contradiction, that there is not a country on earth, where the manufac-

turing interests, after the general peace, suffered more than in England, and where, both during the war and since the peace, the manufacturing system is the acknowledged source of so much misery. On this last topic we beg leave to quote the words of Mr Southey, of whom it is enough perhaps to say, in order to guarantee his impartiality on this subject, that he is one of the principal Quarterly Reviewers. The work, which we cite, was published about 1805.

‘With all its boasted wealth and prosperity, England is at the mercy of the seasons. One unfavorable harvest occasions dearth; and what the consequences of famine would be in a country, where the poor are already so numerous and wretched, is a question, which the boldest statesman dares not ask himself. When volunteer forces were raised over the kingdom, the poor were excluded; it was not thought safe to trust them with arms. But the peasantry are and ought to be the strength of every country; and woe to that country, when the peasantry and poor are the same! Many causes have contributed to the rapid increase of this evil. The ruinous wars of the present reign, and the oppressive system of taxation pursued by the late *premier* are among the principal. But the manufacturing system is the main cause; it is the inevitable tendency of that system to multiply the number of the poor, and to make them vicious, diseased, and miserable.’

The same eloquent writer thus speaks in another passage of the same work;

‘We purchase English cloth, English muslins, English buttons, &c. and admire the excellent skill with which they are fabricated, and wonder that from such a distance they can be afforded us at so low a price, and think what a happy country England is. A happy country indeed it is for the higher orders; nowhere have the rich so many enjoyments, nowhere have the ambitious so fair a field, nowhere have the ingenious such encouragement, nowhere have the intellectual such advantages; but to talk of English happiness is like talking of Spartan freedom; the Helots are overlooked. In no other country can such riches be acquired by commerce, but it is the *one* who grows rich by the labors of the *hundred*. The hundred human beings like himself, as wonderfully fashioned by nature, gifted with the like capacities, and equally made for immortality, are sacrificed body and soul. Horrible as it must needs appear, the assertion is true to the very letter. They are deprived in childhood of all instruction and all enjoyment; of the sports in which childhood instinctively indulges; of fresh air by day, and of natural sleep by night. Their health, physical and moral, is alike de-

stroyed ; they die of diseases induced by unremitting taskwork, by confinement in the impure atmosphere of crowded rooms, by the particles of metallic or vegetable dust, which they are constantly inhaling ; or they live to grow up without decency, without comfort, and without hope ; without morals, without religion, without shame, and bring forth slaves like themselves, to tread in the same path of misery.

‘The dwellings of the laboring manufacturers are in narrow streets and lanes, blocked up from light and air, not as in our country, [Spain] to exclude an insupportable sun, but crowded together, because every inch of land is of such value, that room for light and air cannot be afforded them. Here in Manchester, a great proportion of the poor lodge in cellars, damp and dark, where every kind of filth is suffered to accumulate, because no exertions of domestic care can ever make such homes decent. These places are so many hotbeds of infection, and the poor in large towns are rarely or never without an infectious fever among them, a plague of their own, which leaves the habitations of the rich, like a Goshen of cleanliness and comfort, unvisited. * * *

‘The poor must be kept miserably poor, or such a state of things could not continue ; there must be laws to regulate their wages, not by the value of their work, but by the pleasure of their masters ; laws to prevent their removal from one place to another, within the kingdom, and to prohibit their emigration out of it. They would not be crowded in hot task houses by day, and herded together in damp cellars by night ; they would not toil in unwholesome employments from sunrise till sunset, whole days, and whole days and quarters, for with twelve hours’ labor the avidity of trade is not satisfied ; they would not sweat night and day, keeping up this *laus perennis* of the devil, before furnaces which are never suffered to cool, and breathing in vapors which inevitably produce disease and death ; the poor would never do these things, unless they were miserably poor, unless they were in that state of abject poverty, which precludes instruction, and by destroying all hope for the future reduces man like the brutes, to seek for nothing beyond the gratification of present wants.’

Such was a picture of real life, some eighteen or twenty years ago, in a country where manufactures are protected by a system, which is held up to us for our admiration and as our exemplar. It is of importance to ask, how far this protecting system attains its end ? Our readers will bear in mind, that the decline and ruin of some branches of our manufactures, at the close of the war, were ascribed—constantly, passionately ascribed—to the want of protection. Let us now see

how the case stood in England at the same time. Our extracts are somewhat long; but they will reward the patience of the reader.

‘ Extract from a Letter written by a Resident at Cosely, near Bels-ton in Staffordshire.

‘ When some of our principal iron works first failed, the whole extent of the consequent distress was not immediately apparent. The poor manufacturers had many of them made a little money; this with the greatest frugality did not last long; when expended they ran in debt, wherever they could gain credit; and when they could not be trusted any longer, they pawned or sold their furniture, article after article, till they had none to sell. When their goods were gone, they were obliged to have recourse to their parishes and to begging. The parishes were overwhelmed by the numbers applying for their aid, and could afford but little comparative support. The community in general (for commercial districts are usually generous) made great efforts to relieve their distresses. For my own part, I determined that I would fare harder, and that my children and household should do so likewise, in order to minister to their wants; and it was my desire that none, worthy of relief, should go away from my house unrelieved. It is true the succor was but small; and they asked for nothing but a piece of bread, and bread for some time great numbers of them received; but I soon found that my very limited income, arising chiefly from uncertain sources, would not even furnish this scanty supply, and I was reduced to the necessity, to me a most painful one, of confining my charity within much smaller boundaries. Companies of five, or eight, or twelve manufacturers, able and willing to work, have been many times in the course of a day at my door, soliciting bread, and what has often cut me to the heart, necessarily soliciting in vain. Multitudes went through the country, offering to work at anything, merely for a little food, not even expecting wages, and thus gained a little temporary employment and subsistence; but still their wives and children were at home, in the greatest possible distress.

‘ Within a small distance of my house is a large iron work, the machinery of which extends for nearly half a mile. It was a noble manufactory. I passed by it one morning, after its operations were suspended, and was exceedingly affected with the sight. A little before, it was all animation and industry, affording the honorable means of livelihood to many thousands of my fellow creatures. The silence that now pervades it spoke more eloquently and impressively to my heart, than any language could possibly do; it was the silence of unmingled desolation. I visited a row of houses occupied by the workmen; the doors were used to be open, in-

viting the eye of the stranger to glance as he went along at their neatness, cleanliness, and felicity ; little groups of healthful children were accustomed to appear about the cottages, full of merriment and joy, and the inhabitants, strong and healthy, saluted you as you went by. But the scene was lamentably changed, it produced a melancholy on my spirits, that I did not lose for a considerable period, the cottages were closed, the inhabitants could not bear to have it known that they were stripped of their little ornaments, no children played around the doors, the very plants trained up in their windows had pined and died, one man only appeared, emaciated and ghastly, a living spectre, as if the peaceful sepulchre had sent forth its inhabitants to fill with terror the abodes of the living. When I have told these poor creatures, that the parish must find them food or labor, they have replied, " Sir, they cannot do either ;" and some who have fared the best, when our manufactories were flourishing about us, have said, " we would rather die, sir, than be dependent on the parish."

' It is an unanswerable proof of the excellent disposition of these poor manufacturers, that although there are many thousands of them in the most distressed condition imaginable, there is very little depredation in the country. If it will aid you in your benevolent designs, I will go through any part of our neighborhood, from house to house, and give you a particular statement of the circumstances of each family. The labor will be to me a delightful remuneration ; doing good I have long found to be its own reward. I would devote any portion of my time to procure you information. Some, I believe, have really died of starvation ; and in many cases, if not the *immediate*, it was the *primary* cause. An insufficiency of wholesome nourishment, where they had been accustomed to great abundance, produced diseases, which terminated in dissolution.

' Even *charity*, sir, has left some of our districts. She has given all she had to give ; the stream of her benevolence is dried up, and nothing remains but the grateful recollection of the channel through which it flowed, or emotions of despair lest it should never again be replenished. I could send you many individual cases that come under my personal knowledge. *Not far from my house, a respectable individual, possessed of extensive information in the iron trade, who had been a confidential foreman in a large concern, and lived in much credit, has been for some time, with a wife and eight children, destitute of a sufficiency of bread.* Many poor families, distinguished for their sobriety and industry, with five, six, seven, or eight children, are in the same disastrous circumstances. I have, myself, repeatedly saved a man, his wife, and six children, from absolute starvation, who were reduced to eat the cabbage stalks, and the refuse of their little cottage garden, as the only food they could obtain.'

In the month of October of the same year, 1816, the iron manufacturers, in one district in Wales, to the number of ten or twelve thousand, traversed the country begging bread and cheese, but refusing beer, 'lest in their intoxication they should do what they would afterwards be sorry for.' We have no space for further details of their sufferings, but beg leave to present our readers with a view of the condition of the cotton manufacturers in England in 1818. For this purpose we lay before them 'the cotton spinners' address to the public,' in August, 1818.

'We, the Mule cotton spinners of Manchester, consider it a duty incumbent upon us to address the public, at the present juncture, to contradict the many false statements and misrepresentations, that have appeared in the public papers.

'We are stated in all the papers to have turned out for an advance of wages, this we admit to be in part true, but not absolutely so. Two years ago, when our employers demanded a reduction of ten hanks, they affirmed that the state of the market imperiously called for such reduction; but when the markets would admit of an advance, they would willingly give it. We depended on their honor, and continued to labor for more than twelve months at the reduction proposed. About ten months since, on comparing the price of cotton and yarn, we found that the markets would allow our employers to fulfil their promise; we therefore solicited them to that purpose, and only wished to be reinstated in the same prices we worked at, previous to that reduction. Some declared they could not give it; others they would not, but the greater part, that they would, if others did, but they should not like to be the first. Thus we continued working and soliciting for the last eight months, though the demand for yarn has been unprecedented, and the consequent rise in twist great; they have still refused our just request; and in order to cause a belief that trade was in a declining state, gave notice that they should only work three days in the week, which appeared so extremely ridiculous, that the very children employed in the factories laughed at it.

'It is asserted that our average wages amount to thirty or forty shillings per week. It is evident that this statement was made by some individual either ignorant or interested. In 1816, the average clear wages of the spinners in Manchester was about twenty four shillings. They were then reduced from twenty to twenty five per cent, and have ever since labored under that reduction, and it is to be remarked, that spinners relieve their own sick, as well as subscribe to other casualties; therefore, when their hours of labor, *which are from five in the morning to seven in the evening*, (and

in some mills longer) of unremitting toil, in rooms heated from seventy to ninety degrees, are taken into consideration, we believe the public will say with us, that no body of workmen receive so inadequate a compensation for their labor.

‘The next thing we would advert to is, our employers have asserted, that if they submit to our present request, which they admit is reasonable, it would not be long before we demanded another advance of ten hanks more. Whatever some individuals may have said, we know nothing of, but the great majority of spinners have never said or intended any such thing. And we hereby declare, “that we are willing to enter into a treaty with our employers on fair and honorable terms.”

‘We believe there is no species of labor so fraught with the want of natural comforts, as that the spinners have to contend with; deprived of fresh air, and subjected to long confinement in the impure atmosphere of crowded rooms continually inhaling the particles of metallic or vegetable dust, his physical powers become debilitated, his animal strength dwindles away, and few survive the meridian of life, and the grave is often the welcome asylum of his woes. His children! but let us draw a veil over the scene, our streets exhibit their cadaverous and decrepit forms, and any attempt to describe them would be impossible.

‘Let it not be understood that we attach blame to our employers as applied to these calamities; they are perhaps inseparable from the very nature of the employment, and our masters may lament but cannot redress them. All we ask is a fair and candid investigation into the grounds of our complaints, and we are confident that both justice and humanity will decide in our favor.

‘We solemnly declare, as fathers, as men, as loyal subjects, and well wishers to a constitution, the spirit and letter of which will not countenance anything like slavery and oppression, *that we cannot obtain, with the greatest possible industry, the common comforts and necessities of life at the present low prices.* To labor hard is not an easy task, but to labor hard and want is impossible. Let our masters consult their own hearts, and as the seat of justice and humanity, they will not long hesitate to grant our just request.’

We appeal to such of our readers as are conversant, even with the English newspapers, to bear us out in the assertion, that volumes of details like these might be collected. It is therefore only in the heat of argument, that propositions like the following could be advanced by such men as Mr Clay.

‘The views of British prosperity, which I have endeavored to present, show that her protecting policy is adapted alike to a state of war and of peace. Self poised, resting upon her own internal

resources, possessing a home market, carefully cherished and guarded, she is ever prepared for any emergency. *We have seen her coming out of a war of incalculable exertion, and of great duration, with her power unbroken, her means undiminished.* We have seen, that almost every revolving year of peace has brought along with it an increase of her manufactures, of her commerce, and, consequently, of her navigation. We have seen that, constructing her prosperity upon the solid foundation of her own protecting policy, *it is unaffected by the vicissitudes of other states.* What is our own condition? Depending upon the state of foreign powers—confiding exclusively in a foreign, to the culpable neglect of a domestic, policy—our interests are affected by all their movements. Their wars, their misfortunes, are the only source of our prosperity. *In their peace, and our peace, we behold our condition the reverse of that of Great Britain,* and all our interests stationary or declining. Peace brings to us none of the blessings of peace.’

We confess we perceive none of the facts, by which this comparison is borne out; nor by what possible agency a tariff of duties, either in England or America, can be depended on to prevent immense distresses on any sudden change either from peace to war, or war to peace. Such a transition must always produce vast and sudden fluctuations in the market, and against these changes what tariff can protect us?

The extracts we have already made are sufficient preparation for the remark, paradoxical as it may seem, that all the protection extended by the foreign governments held up to our imitation has not produced the prosperity of manufactures themselves, considered as one of the branches of the national industry. It might be taken as one proof of this, that, with the extraordinary growth of manufacturing industry in England, for the last half century, *pauperism* has kept equal pace, and has, within the last generation, been carried to a height unexampled and truly appalling. It is easy to deny this to be the effect of any necessary connexion between the things, and yet those, who deny it, may safely be challenged to point out any other cause. The factories create a demand for a large quantity of manual labor of the very lowest kind. It is well known, that a few weeks are sufficient to train most of the laborers employed in spinning cotton, and the exercise of intellect in this occupation is almost nothing. Labor of this kind *must* be miserably paid. Mere hand labor is very little

higher in the order of things than machine labor. A living machine endued with a grain of intellect is needed ; no more. This is the kind of population, which manufactures tend directly to introduce ; and it needs not be said, that it is a wretched population at best, exposed on every fluctuation of the market to be thrown out of employment, and ill fitted for any other.

But without urging this point, and allowing that in this respect things may possibly be somewhat more prosperous in America, we still maintain that there is not a country in the world where the great manufactures, those most protected, flourish. By a flourishing manufacture, in any valuable sense of the term, we mean one that supports the working class in decent competence. In almost every branch of manufactures, in every country, the wages of labor, like the wages of sin, is death ; and we may well add with Dr South, poor wages it is that will not keep a man alive. The cloth, the cutlery, is good, and much is made, and it sells to profit, and the proprietor of the factory flourishes and grows rich, but what becomes of the manufacturer ? Is it flourishing to weave and spin sixteen hours in the day on wages so confessedly inadequate, as to require from the overseers of the poor an additional shilling per week, for every child with which the miserable father is cursed ? The manufacture of muslin flourishes, we suppose, in India, where those who weave it sit up to their armpits in water, twelve hours in the day, and are paid with a cup of rice. The Osnaburghs of Westphalia are woven by the poor peasantry of that country, who live in cabins, to which the meanest log hut in America is a palace. Is this flourishing ? The manufacturers of iron in Russia and Sweden earn seven cents a day. Is this flourishing ?

Why do not the friends of the tariff, who admire the foreign protecting policy, imitate it in its prominent parts ? There are in many of these countries, and have been in all, laws regulating the wages, which shall be paid to workmen in the different trades. Let them apply to Congress for a law, that the laborer shall be paid but seven or eight cents a day. This will go effectually to the case, and enable the American undertaker to meet the foreign commodity. The mere smallness of wages, moreover, is but one only of the ingredients in that system, which we are taught to admire and strive to in-

introduce. Seven cents a day in a country, where one hundred and twenty thousand men are serfs on the estate of one landholder ; where it is the proudest privilege of the human stock, that it cannot be sold without the soil ; seven cents a day in such a country may be very tolerable wages. It will buy a man a little meal and a little lard for his food, and a piece of coarse tow or woollen cloth for his clothing, and with this he is amply provided. A few shillings a week may be very tolerable wages in a country like England, where the people, as a mass, have no voice in the government, where a great inequality of rank and power is an acknowledged and recognised part of the system, at which no one murmurs ; where the honors, the prizes of life, with some few exceptions, that prove the rule, are placed at a hopeless distance from all competition on the part of the laboring classes. But this is all different here. A manufacturer's vote is as good as his employer's. He expects to dwell, not in as good a house, and also in none of your Manchester cellars, but in an exceedingly comfortable tight tenement. On Sundays, he expects to wear very nearly as good a coat and hat as his rich neighbor, and to see his wife and daughter in a cambric or a silk. If either of his boys is at all clever, he expects to send him to the grammar school in the town, or the next academy, to prepare for college and receive an education, that shall fit him for the highest places of professional respectability. The wages of the manufacturer must be calculated on this scale ; they must support, not a degraded, brutified vassal, but a reflecting, aspiring man, a freeholder, a voter, a constituent of those, who make the laws and who govern the country.

The English system of eking out the laborer's wages by the contributions of the overseers of the poor and the parish officers will not do here. The elder and graver laborer will not seldom be a deacon and an overseer himself. The system of eating meat once or twice a week only will not do here ; our manufacturers will take no protection, which does not protect them in a hearty dinner of meat every day, with enough left cold to come handsomely upon the table the next morning at breakfast. The manufacturer here is surrounded by a different class of men, from those about him there, and he must live accordingly. He is not surrounded by an humbled tenantry, who if they possess not each an annual income of one

hundred pound, cannot shoot a partridge even on a field they might own in fee simple ; and who if they be not freeholders have no votes in the election of those, who are to make the laws. Our factories will be principally filled by the daughters of very respectable farmers, who come for a few years to earn a sum of money toward a virtuous and honorable establishment in life. The system must become corrupt sooner than we think it possible in the American community, or it will be long before our factories resemble the English. We have as good proofs as the circumstances of the case admit, that more than one cotton factory in that country unites within its walls a greater complication of human vice and suffering, than can elsewhere on earth perhaps be found ; the liberty of a prison, the leisure of a workhouse, the health of a hospital, and the chastity of a harem. This will not do here. Our manufacturers will have more moral as well as physical oxygen in their atmosphere. Till the friends of the tariff policy can produce us an example of a manufacture abroad, which comes up to the American notions of the condition of those, who, doing the work of society are entitled, if not to its luxuries, at least to its comforts, we shall persist in saying that manufactures do not flourish abroad.

In the next place, while we are zealously quoting the example of foreign nations in this system, the statesmen of England are acknowledging its vicious principle, and, as fast as circumstances admit, are changing it for a more liberal one. The proofs of this position in Mr Webster's speech are so ample, confirmed as they have been by every subsequent arrival from Europe, that we shall not dwell on the topic. It is with pain that we see the Chairman of the Committee reasserting that no proof was found of this proposition, beyond a few detached speeches ; and repeating what we must needs esteem the paltry suggestion, that this change of doctrines was only deceptively proclaimed in order to mislead foreign nations. We will only ask what the American public would think and say, if the chairman of an important committee of the House of Commons in England, should intimate that one of the cabinet officers of America, in the deliberate commendation of any particular policy, had no object but to deceive foreign governments into an adoption of it ?

The last remark, which we have to make on the subject of imitating the foreign policy is this, that if no other reason existed why it could not or should not be imitated ; if all that we have said to show that the system does not attain its objects abroad were groundless ; it would still remain true, that in the most important circumstance bearing upon this subject, the position of America is so different from that of Europe, that her example cannot wisely be followed by us. We refer, of course, to the abundance and cheapness of land here, and to its scarcity and dearness in Europe. This point would admit a very copious illustration, but we will try to respect the patience of our readers. We would only observe that the least parallelism exists between that foreign country and ours, where the greatest has been alleged by the friends of the tariff, viz. between Russia and America. Russia is indeed vast, but that is not enough to produce a resemblance with America. By the latest authorities, the mass of the civilised population, that is, the population exclusive of Cossacks and Tartars, in European Russia, presents the enormous contrast of twenty four millions of serfs, bought and sold with the soil, and less than two millions of all classes of free population. In 1783 the number of free male persons was one million eighty four thousand four hundred and eighty six, and the number of male serfs, eleven million three hundred and fifty two thousand eight hundred and forty two. It is plain that, in such a state of things, though the Russian government could add to its possessions, already sizeable, those other wide tracts, which captain Symmes has discovered in its neighborhood, no encouragement could result to settlement, and no comparison be authorised in this respect between Russia and the United States.

Our limits do not permit us to engage in anything like a discussion of the general question of the tariff policy, and we shall only trespass farther on the reader's patience, with a cursory notice of a few separate arguments.

It is objected, and of course with justice, to the tariff policy, that its immediate effect is to give the domestic manufacturer the monopoly of the fabric. To this, however, the friends of the tariff reply, that this effect is only temporary, and that the speedy and final effect will be, by drawing capital into the protected manufacture, to destroy monopoly and

bring the price down to its natural level, and a sentiment pretended to amount to this has been quoted a few hundred times from general Hamilton's Report. The delusion, however, is so gross, that we can scarce suppose any one should be the victim of it himself, or impose it on another. Nothing is more true than that competition will soon destroy the monopoly, which those manufacturers possess, who are at work when the foreign article is shut out ; but will it destroy the monopoly of the American manufacturer as such ? Will not the whole supply be engrossed by him ? But still we are told capital will flow in to the employment if profitable, and the price will come down to the *natural level*. No doubt, to the natural level of this country, and no lower ; and this natural level in America will, in almost every article, be higher than the natural level in England, or France, or Russia, and for the reasons of which we have given some above. It will be as much higher, as capital is less abundant, land plentier, the style of living and place in society better among the American than the foreign manufacturers. In short, the country will be permanently taxed a sum amounting to all the difference of the cost of producing an article in this country and bringing it from abroad. And this, for a long time, will be considerable in most articles, and in some it will be always greater or less, unless we are hereafter to have our happy country filled up with the mournful spectacle of an English, French, or Russian peasantry.

Another argument made use of by the friends of the tariff policy is, that the manufacturing interest requires that protection, which, in the form of discriminating duties, has been extended to the shipping interest, till lately in both branches, and still in the coasting trade. This argument, however, assumes what we can never allow to be a fact, that these discriminating duties were intended merely to secure to the navigation of the country the supply of the demand for water carriage. As it is the great end of the English navigation act, so it has been the true policy of our discriminating duties, to nourish the mercantile, for the sake of the naval marine. It ought to be put on no other ground, and it can be defended on no other. If there were any reasonable probability, that the naval strength of this country could be kept in a condition, required by our safety and honor, without that encouragement

of our shipping, which the discriminating duties afford, they ought not to subsist one hour. These duties are defended on precisely the same ground as the establishment of national factories for the supply of arms, and on the principle that the public defence must be secured at any sacrifice.

For ourselves, we can truly say, that we think the principle laid down in the much quoted letter of Mr Jefferson to the late Mr Benjamin Austin, the sound principle ; and by no means at variance with the passages in the Notes on Virginia, which it was intended to modify or explain. Prove of any fabric that it can fairly be called a necessary, or comfort of life, for which the country is dependent on a foreign and unfriendly nation ; prove that it is essential to the honor and independence of the country, that it flourish on our soil, and we should be the first to protect it up to the prohibition of the foreign article. For all the rest, we think that private judgment should be the guide. We have no doubt that the home market is the better market ; and as little that the nation is the richer, for the greater variety of employments pursued by its citizens. But we maintain, that these cannot be profitably introduced by legislative enactments ; that neither in the form of a tariff, nor in any other form, is it in the power of Congress to enact the country into riches, faster than the natural course of industry, and the natural increase of capital can acquire them. And above all, we strenuously deny, that the country can become rich by compelling consumers, (the great mass,) to pay a greater amount of their labor or its fruits for the same necessary or convenience.

Meantime the republic is safe. The bill as it passed is divested of many injurious provisions ; and if it had not been, had it passed as reported, the country would still be safe. It would in that case have been our opinion, that a majority of Congress, and by inference a majority of the citizens had willed an injudicious law ; a law laying a heavy tax, without any general advantage. But that would not ruin us ; nothing, while our free institutions remain, can fatally affect us. Neither foreign hostility, domestic feuds, nor legislative errors, can fatally injure us, while the representative system exists in its present purity. We may commit errors, and pay dearly for them, and doubtless shall. But if a law is pernicious it will soon be repealed, and though repealing a bad law does not

always undo its bad effects, nor take place without new sacrifices, yet that is a truly enviable condition of human existence, where either errors will not be committed, or the power of correcting them is in the hands of those who suffer. The American nation is in that condition, and before it can cease to be so, many things worse than a heavy tariff must be borne ; and when it ceases to be so, the liberty of trade will not be worth saving.

ART. XIII.—MISCELLANEOUS NOTICES.

1.—*Boston Prize Poems, and other Specimens of Dramatic Poetry.* Boston. 1824.

THIS little work comprises a selection from the poems, presented during the last winter to the managers of the Boston Theatre for the prize, proposed by them on the occasion of a Jubilee in honor of Shakspeare. Several of these compositions are very respectable ; and the Ode marked No. 1, may be thought by some not to fall far short of that which obtained the premium. Mr Sprague, the successful candidate, gained the prizes both in Philadelphia and New York, for the best prologue on the opening of the theatres lately erected there. We believe that there were more than twenty candidates in each of these cases. The chance is against any man's writing good poetry upon a trite subject, and one not selected by himself. But to have succeeded thrice in such a trial is more than could be expected to happen to any poet. There is good fortune as well as desert in it ; the judges may be all men of discernment ; but there is such a difficulty in coming to an agreement in matters of mere taste, and the standard is so loose and various, that the chances of repeated success are much against any one individual, whatever may be his talents.

The Ode of Mr Sprague opens with an invocation to the ' God of the glorious lyre.' The second stanza setting forth the invasion of the northern barbarians is highly picturesque.

Fierce from the frozen north,
When havoc led his legions forth,
O'er learning's sunny groves the dark destroyers spread ;
In dust the sacred statue slept,
Fair science round her altars wept,
And wisdom cowed his head.